



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,180	01/23/2004	Daniel ManHung Wong	50277-2405	7861
29989	7590	06/08/2007	EXAMINER	
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP			NGUYEN, CAM LINH T	
2055 GATEWAY PLACE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 550			2161	
SAN JOSE, CA 95110				

  

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/764,180	WONG, DANIEL MANHUNG	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	CamLinh Nguyen	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2007.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1, 4, 7 – 10, 13, and 16 – 18 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1, 4, 7 – 10, 13, and 16 – 18 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/8 &amp; 2/14/07</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 2161

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/14/2007 has been entered.

2. Applicant's amendments to claims 1 – 18 are acknowledged. Consequently, claims 2 – 3, 11 – 12, 14 – 15 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 7 – 10, 13, and 16 - 18 are currently pending.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 2/8/2007 and 2/14/2007 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98, and MPEP §600. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements have been placed in the application file and are being considered by the examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 4, 7 – 10, 13, and 16 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara et al (U.S. 2003/0014394 A1) in view of Lei et al (U.S. 6,487,552 B1).

♦ As per claims 1, 10

Fujiwara discloses a machine-implemented method, a machine-readable medium (Fig. 7 of Fujiwara) for managing access to data, the method comprising the steps of:

- “Registering with a database server a user defined policy function supplied by a user” See Fig. 12, in particular:
  - A database server corresponds to database server 722 (See Fig. 7, element 722, paragraph 0040). Fujiwara teaches “a single computer system can be used to host all three servers components in a small scale operation” (page 3, paragraph 0041). Therefore, the Examiner would interpret the reference as single computers sever.
  - A user defined policy function corresponds to the access policy (Fig. 8) that is registered or stored in the database server computer and is provided by the user (administrator personnel or database management personnel) (See paragraph 0044)
- “Said database server detecting that a database command requires access to columns in at least two tables” corresponds to the command send from a user using a third computer system (Fig. 11 wherein the command specified multiple columns, page 3, paragraph 0042, page 6 paragraph 0068 of Fujiwara). Fujiwara discloses a SELECT statement that can select multiple tables (Fig. 11). Therefore, clearly this command requires access to columns in at least two tables as claimed in claims invention.
- “And in response to the step of detecting, said database server invoking of said policy function to generate a condition expression returned by the policy function” See Fig. 12 wherein the query is modified by the access policies (page 6, paragraph 0071 - 0074).

The “condition expression returned by the policy function” corresponds to the mask function as specified in table II (page 6). In addition to this user defined function, there is another user defined function in the DBMS (Fig. 12, element 1212, page 6, paragraph 0074)

- “Rewriting said database command by creating a modified database command to incorporate said condition expression, based on the database command” see page 6, paragraph 0074 wherein the original query is translated (Fig. 12, query 1202 is a rewriting query) to a translated query (modified database command) that incorporate said condition expression (mask functions).

Fujiwara does not clearly disclose the step of “wherein registering cause s said database server to generate database metadata that associates with said policy function”. However, Lei, on the other hand, discloses a method for retrieving data comprising:

Col. 14, lines 4-20 illustrate two queries (Q3 and Q4) made in structured query language (SQL). The queries are made on a relational database (202) having a table (204) which defined rows and columns.

The query Q3 includes a SELECT statement (command “SELECT \*”) and a SELECT clause (the predicate “from t”). The term “t” refers to an entire table, and thus references all the columns in the table “t”. Also see the definition of term “SELECT \*” as defined in Modern Database Management, as attached to this action. It means to select all the columns from a defined table, in this case, the table "t". Database metadata (see policy function implementation col. 16 – 17 of Lei).

In the modified query (Q4), the column references of "t" are replaced by a mask function

Art Unit: 2161

"t.lang", which corresponds to a specific language in the table "t". This causes specific columns in the table "t" to be selected. The access policy is ".Get Context Value (Language) which determines which columns are selected (col. 14, lines 19-20). A condition for the mask function is return from the function call (col. 14, lines 35 – 50).

The result is the query result, which is a set of rows and columns limited to a specific language defined in the mask function.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Lei into the invention of Fujiwara because both inventions were available and the combination would provide the user more control in accessing the data.

♦ As per claims 4, 13, Fujiwara and Lei disclose:

- “Wherein the policy is not triggered by detecting that a database command requires access to a subset of tables of at least two tables, wherein the subset of tables includes at least one table” corresponds to the query that specified one or more columns in a certain table (See paragraph 0068 of Fujiwara).

♦ As per claims 7, 16, Fujiwara and Lei disclose:

- “Wherein the detecting includes detecting that metadata defines the particular combination of columns as a combination of columns to which access is controlled” as indicated above, Fujiwara teaches that the user issues a query that is a combination of columns (paragraph 0068 of Fujiwara) and the access is controlled by including the mask function to mask out some data that the user does not have access permit (paragraph 0075 of Fujiwara).

♦ As per claims 8, 17, Fujiwara and Lei disclose:

Art Unit: 2161

- “Further comprising the step of registering a policy function with a policy, wherein the policy function returns a condition expression, and the modified database command is based on the condition expression and the database command” since the mask functions in the package mask are stored in the web/report server (Fig. 6 - 7 of Fujiwara), the policy must be registered in order to carry out the invention.
- ◆ As per claims 9, 18, Fujiwara and Lei disclose:
  - “Wherein the policy includes metadata identifying columns that are included in the particular combination of information” See Fig. 10 – 13 of Fujiwara wherein the policy includes metadata identifying columns (such as PT\_ID) that are included in the particular combination of information (different tables).

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4, 7 – 10, 13, and 16 – 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CamLinh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272 - 4024. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on (571) 272 - 4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571 – 273 - 8300.

Art Unit: 2161

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nguyen, Cam-Linh

Art Unit 2161

LN

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nguyen, Cam-Linh".